RIDDLE'S REJOINDER.

MORE OF THE BLAINE SCANDAL

A. G. REPLIES TO J. G.

A REVIEW OF THE CASE

INGENIOUS COMBINATION OF THINGS

ABOUT THE CONSTRUCTION BONDS

Blaine's last personal explanation. It consists of

two points : First, Mr. Knowlton's real statement of the connection of Mr. Blaine and J. B. Stewart; second, Mr. Blaine and the Kansas Pacific bonds second, Mr. Binine and the Kansas Pacific bonds as they appear in the records of the Supreme Court in which much new matter is given:

On the first day of the present May Mr. Blaine, from his place in the House of Representatives, sent a New York Herald to the Clerk's desk, and caused to be read an article from a Washington correspondent which gave, as Mr. Blaine said, a summary of current slanders upon him. The first one referred to was the exploded story of the New York Tribune of 1872. The third pangraph of the article sets forth that, some years ago, Mr. Blaine received from J. B. Stewart certain bonds of the Kansas and Pacific railroad, in the office of Stewart & Riddle; that it was alleged that Mr. Hiddle knew a good deal of this matter, and that another principal witness, weather late J. W. Knowlion, who, it was said, witnessed the delivery of the bonds, and that the name of John E. Blaine, a brother of James G., was mixed up also in this transaction. "This very the search was before Yeard Mr. Blaine, and he was lettered the order of the search of the searc wallessed the delivery of the bonds, and that the name of John E. Blaine, a brother of James G., was mixed up also in this transaction. "This story is an old one," said Mr. Blaine, and he made it the burden of his complaint. As witnesses of its authorship and its falsaty, he produced a note written by Mr. Riddle, dated February I, 1873, directly saying that he had no knowledge of the transaction whatever. Also, a letter written by J. B. Stewart. April 2, 1816, repeating a former letter of 1873, who says that he nover saw Mr. Blains in his office in his life, and believes that he never was there; that he never delivered him any bonds of the Kansas Pacific railroad, and never had a business transaction with him in his life; that Mr. Knowlon was the author of the story, and was mift to refract it; that Knowlon soid to him that he told the story as jest, which was published without his knowledge or approbation, &c. Also, a letter written by General Thomas Ewing, March 20, 1873, which amplified his card of October, 1874, so fatal to the Tribuns story above, and he also suggested that the similarity in the sound of the two names, J. E. and J. G. Blaine, had led to the basis of the charge against J. G. Blaine as to the bonds. The next witness was A. M. Gibson, of the New York Sun, who said that in February, (181,) 1873, an article (from him) appeared in the Sun, alleging that Mr. Blaine had

did. Mr. Knowiton said ') Mr. Blains that the report had been made on his apparent responsibility, and he repudiated it and explose I his regret for the annoyance it occasioned Mr. Blains. He macquivocally withdrew the charge, and he always since regretted that he should be quoted for the rumor. That it may be seen what it was that Knowiton refused to be responsible for I quote from that Sun article: "A clerk in Stewart's office tells a circumstantial story about a visit a certain gentleman paid to Stewart's office, and how \$24,000, in guaranteed bonds of the Kansas Pacific road, passed from Stewart's hands to the certain gentleman aloresaid."

It is thus seen that Mr. Knowitor is made

napricate and terms rage to maintie'in.

Mr. Blaine is careful in his own use of language toward Mr. Knowlton. He makes and proves his charge by the mouth of others. I hold him responsible. Upon the evening of the day on which Mr. Blaine's assault appeared in print I addressed him the following note:

Washington, May 2, 1875.

Mr. Binine's assault appeared in print I addressed him the following note:

**Binine's assault appeared in print I addressed him the following note:

**Binine's assault appeared in print I addressed him the following note:

**Six: Having made the occasion and prepared the means, or yesterday, from your place on the floor of the House, you assaulted the reputation of James Welcott Knowiton, then two years and a half in his grave. Had he survived until today you would have remained eilent, and your Joe Stewarts and MacFarlands would have told no tales. He left a w'low'd mother, and two young sisters in Washington and a brother in a distant city. He was the husband of my daughter, and as dear to me and mine as if born and 'reared one of my family. It devolves on me to vindicate as I best may his memory from your aspersions, which i shall do at an early, lay. No one knows better than yourself that I am moved to this labor solely by my daty to my dead.

Very sincerely, I received the following reply:

Bos. A. G. Riddle:

**Dear Sim: I am totally surprised by the tone of your note tenching Mr. Knowlton. I was especially careful to make no reference to him that in my judgment could offend the most sensitive iteeling. You cannot but be aware that Mr. Knowlton's name has been used for some years past, and with viodictive force and frequency this winter, to injure me. Testimony reported as coming from him, but which you knew he never gave, has been carried and quoted in all directions, and I had to choose between disproving it and tacitly admitting it with all its damaging imputations: but no one save yourself can see in mylreference to him memory. On the contrary, it relieves him from the authorship of an unfounded calumny, If, however, you judge it to be wise, or prudent, or expedient to seek a personal controversy with more. Nor can I believe that, on cool reflection, you will permit yourself to do anything so unculled for, and in all respects so extraordinary.

Very respectinity.

**Lesk attention to the followin

tione, strictly responsive to notes addressed by me to the writers severally:

STATEMENT OF GENERAL H. V. BOYNTON.

WASHINGTON, May 4, 1872.

WASHINGTON, May 4, 1872.

Your letter of yesterday has reached me. In it you call my attention to the personal explanation made by hr. Blaine in the House of Representative, on the let instant, and ask me to state to you the character of my acquaintance with James W. Knowiton, my estimate of him as a man of truth and honor, the nature of the statement he made to me in regard to Mr. Blaine, the circumstances under which he made it, whether he ever changed or varied this statement to my knowledge, how the imcorrect allusions to it came to be printed, the course taken by Mr. Knowiton in reference to this publication, an what I know concerning his acquaintance with Mr. Blains, and in what shape the bond question has been of late preference to Mr. Blaine.

Mr. Knowiton, as Washingtor on respondent of the Chicago Tribune, was my business associate from the autumn of 1870 to the summer of 1872, and thereafter my intimate triend until his death in November, 1872. So far as my knowledge of him extended, he capaged a high reputation among his associates as a man of unblemished honor, and a most careful and exact correspondent, and during my daily and class association with him, nothing was ever brought to my attention at yvariance with this reputation.

The statement be made to me in regard to Mr.

Notat Stewart to the jail of the District, instead of the more comfortable quarters in the Capitol.

The next day after Stewart's arraignment in the House an incorrect version of his (Knowlton's) statement appeared in the New York Sun of February 1, 1878, which, after referring to reports in circulation concerning alleged relations between Mr. Blaine and Mr. Stewart, continued: "A clerk in Stewart's office tells a circumstantial story about a visit a certain gentleman paid to Stewart's office and engalt and how \$24,000 in guaranteed bonds of the Kansas Pacific road passed from Stewart's hands to the certain gentleman aforesaid."

When this dispatch returned, Mr. Knowlton

Stewart's omee late one night, and how \$22,000 in guaranteed bonds of the Kaneas Pacific road passed from Stewart's hands to the certain gentleman aforesaid."

When this dispatch returned, fMr. Knowlton was exceedingly suprised and annoyed, and consulted me at length in regard to the matter. I advised him to print the very exact statement he had previously given me. He replied, that under no circumstances could be do this, and that he must at all hazards avoid being called before the committee in regard to it, for in the first place he had a friendly regard for Mr. Riaine, and admired him greatly as a politician, and he would not appear against him.

In the second place, his associations in Washington and those of his family, aside from his newspaper friends, were chiefly with the bar of the District, and that his approaching marriage into your own family would largely extend his associations in the same direction. As what he had done and seen in the office of Stewart & Riddle took place under the privileges and confidences which attach to a lawyer's office, he was unwilling to subject his iriends or himself to the criticisms which would follow in the circles where they moved, if he were held up to them as one who had attacked a public man by violating the confidences of a law office. Our own conversation had been 'n the confidence of intimate friendship, with no intention on his part that it should lead to turther circulation or printing, and sirric injunctions that it should not. After examining the dispatch, and say that, if called upon, he should be obliged to textify to that effect.

Subsequently be informed me that Mr. Biaine had sout for him, and that he called and made the same statement to him, and that Mr. Hisine had further sought to convince him that it was his cousin, Gen. Thomas Ewing, Jr., who had legal relations with Stewart on the night in question. Mr. Knowlton said to me in relation to this, that, while he was absolutely certain that it was his cousin, Gen. Thomas Ewing, Jr., who had legal re

obliged to swear with positiveness that it was Mr. Biaine who visited Stewart's office under the circumstances already related.

In several subsequent conversations Mr. Knowlton went over this ground, always affirming the correctness of his statement regarding the night visit to Stewart, and never, under any circumstances, alluding to it as the transaction which was charged and afterwards retracted in the New York Tribune of September or October, 1872. The Tribune's charge was quite a different thing, being to the effect, that Mr. Blaine held at one time in his own right \$5.95,000, and for distribution \$4.625,600 in the stocks and lands of the Leavenworth, Pawnee and Western railroad. A fac simile from the recerds of that road was printed in the Tribune of October 2.1872, to prove this, which fac simile was afterwards admitted to be erroneous, and the charge founded upon it to be false.

In regard to the nature of Mr. Knowiton's acquaintance with Mr. Blaine at the time the Sun dispatch was printed, I can only say that it was a matter of very great surprise to me to read that Mr. Knowiton had asked any one to introduce him to Mr. Blaine. As a matter of het, Mr. Blaine himself informed me, some weeks ago, that it was quite another gentleman from the one whose letters he now quotes who introduced Mr. Knowiton on the occasion referred to, and it is a fact within my knowledge that no introduction was needed at that time. Mr. Knowlton may have sought for company but could not have been correctly understood as seeking for some one to present him. The case laid before Mr. Histone for explanation by some of his friends a number of weeks since, and by yourself first of all, was not based upon Mr. Knowlton't statement, but upon certain swern records in the courts.

I have thus answered your inquiries as briefly as a statement of the main features of the case would allow, and I shall be very glad if it proves of any value to you in the purpose expressed in your letter to me to vindicate the thoroughly honorable course pursued by Mr. Knowlton in all this matter.

Hon. A. G. Ridd'e, Washington, D. C.

Hon. A. G. Ridd'e, Washington, D. C.

ORN. R. D. MUSSEY'S STATEMENT.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 5, 1876.

Hon. A. G. Riddle, Present:

Dear Sir: In reply to yours of the 3d-inst., I have to say—

1. The late J. W. Knowlton and myself were students in your law office in this city in 1856-67. Cur deaks were in the main office, in which was also yours. Mr. Stewart had a private office, where he received his visitors. Subsequent to my admission to the bar, I retained my dosk in your office for soveral months. It was Mr. Knowlton's habit and mine to spend many of our evenings at the office during such part of the summer of 1866 as I was here, and also during the winter and spring of 1855-27. My acquaintance with Mr. Knowlton, formed when we were students together, continued after he became a journalist resident here, and I had been admitted to practice at the bar of the District, and I frequently dropped into his office on Fourteenth street.

Once on calling on him at his office he asked me if I remembered ever, while I was a student or had a deak in the office of Stewart & Riddle, to have seen Mr. Blaine (the then Speaker) in that office. I said I recollected seeing him there, but could not name any special occasion, and asked him why he made the inquiry. He then spoke of the interview between Mr. Blaine, had Idenied ever being in that office. Mr. Blaine came with Mr. Stewart, art, and said that Mr. Blaine, had Idenied ever being in that office.

The interview referred to between Mr. Blaine and Mr. Stewart, as stated by Mr. Knowlton, was as follows: Mr. Blaine came with Mr. Stewart one evening into the Colonization building while Knowlton was at his desk in the main office, and passed in together into Stewart barivate office, where Blaine had meantime remained.

2. This statement he never changed or varied see far set know, nor did he ever say that it had been made in jest.

3. I say to you as I did to Knowlton, that my recollection is distinct that while I was on the Avenue on the way to the Capitol.

4. What I have GRN. H. D. MUSSEY'S STATEMENT.

referred to, and never had a business transaction with Stewart in his life. He said he could see how knowlton may have supposed he had seen him at that office—he had mistaken his cousin. Tom Ewing, ir., for him; that in their school or college days they greatly resembled each other, and were often mistaken for each other; that Tom; had business transactions with Stewart about the time referred to—an explanation which he has twice repeated to me since, and the lest time within a month. At that interview Mr. Blaine asked me if I had any personal knowledge of any transaction like that detailed in the Sun. I answered not the slightest. Had I ever seen him in my office! With his declaration justimade that he was never in it, I answered I never had. He asked me if I would put this in writing, and with the Sus article before me I did so. The first scattenee of my note refers to that article, the last was added at the request of Mr. Blaine.

I knew from personal conservation, for several days following the interview, that Knowlton was very much distressed, though I made no inquiries of him. I afterwards heard from those nearest him, whom I do not care to name, that he said, two or three days later, that it was understood between Mr. Blaine and himself, as to Blaine's being at the office, it was to be regarded as a case of mistaken identity on his part; but so apprehensive was he of being compelled to testify, and so determined to avoid it, that he was prepared to go away until the matter should subside, saying that if questioned on oath he would be obliged to say that he did see him there.

The mixing of the name of John Ewing Blaine with this bood story compels me to refer reluciantly to another matter. Differences arose between Stewart and the Union P. R. R. Co., E. D., concerning the ownership of 140 or 150 of the 25) bonds of the company, placed by it in his hands. In August, 1828, Stewart commenced as suit in the United States district court for Kansas vs. The Company and others, to enforce his claim to the bonds.

Some time late in 1874, or early in 1875, Stewart

United States district court for Kansas vs. The Company and others, to enforce his claim to the bonds.

Some time late in 1874, or early in 1875, Stewart sent me a printed transcript of over 20 pages of the evidence in the case, which I laid by for months without examination. Afterwards I found in it a letter from J. B. Stewart to John D. Perry, president of the company, wherein Stewart stated that "James Binine" was an owner of fifteen of these bonds. [See letter of April 22, 1868, hereafter quoted.] This was a surprise, as I found no explanation or statement that there was a mistake in the name. I showed it to Francis Milier, evq., my office associate, and later in the autumn, when Mr. Blaine was coming into prominence as a national candidate, we discussed the duty and propriety of bringing it to his notice. The case had been appealed to the Supreme Court, the record would be printed, and probably tried at the ensuing term. We were both very friendly to him, but I hesitated. He might know of it. It might look like the zeal of one who wished to lay the apparently coming man under obligation. In my anxiety I applied to General Boynton, whose friendship I had long enjoyed, and whom I knew to personally friendly to Mr. Blaine, and on whose discretion and judgment I could rely, I told him what I had, what I feft to be my duty, and my rejuctance to perform it, and asked him to call, see the evidence and advise me. I spoke to him two or three times, and he called in the early part of Pecember. He examined the letter of Stewart referred to, and said unhesitatingly that it was only the fair and manly thing for any body who was in possession of the evidence to pince it in the hands of Mr. Blaine; that my relation to him was such that it was my duty. Shortly after I called upon General Garfield, who had the same view, and he was present at my interview with Mr. Blaine. I gave him the pampleit. He apparently was unaware of the existence of the Stewart letter, but accounted for it by saying that it was the same old matter

the note of the purpose.

At this last interview I said to Mr. Blaine that in anything which might happen the friends of Mr. Knowston would protect his memory.

henor, and would have signed any statement which he orally made. He made no such statement.

If he did, why should he hesitate to repeat it on cath to a committee of the House? The trath is, he felt and knew that if sworn he would be compelled to affirm the statement made to Bridgman, Mussey and Boy aton, rather than do which he preferred flight.

Mr. Blaine would have it believed that he was never in Stewart's office. Why he is so auxious on this point always surprised me. Gen. Mussey says he saw him there, and that Blaine once asked him if Stewart had returned, while on the way towards the office. If asked, Gen. Mussey may be able to say why he distinctly remembers this.

So far as Macfarland is concerned. Mr. Blaine told Gen. Boynton that another gentleman, whose name I can give, came to introduce Knowfton on that occasion, who was well known to Blaine, and had be an for vests.

The man who would flee rather than repeat a story he had told, to save not himself, but the other party from the consequences of the repetition, was unequal to the invention of the story. Had the disposition existed, his unaided imagination would would have failed to furnish the inclident. He related what he saw. Those who heard it from him believed it.

Though true, it does not follow that the bonds were transferred to Blaine or that Stewart delivered them to him. Stewart says he did not, and I do not intimate that his is the pocition of a man who has received a womany's lavors, and feels bound to protest her name by a denial of her frailty, nor do I comment upon the conclusive nature and value of such evidence.

JOHN E. BLAINL'S CONNICTION WITH THE For this I must turn to the r- ord of the case of Stewart vs. The Union Pacific Patiroad Company, Eastern division, a work of 1,175 pages.

Stewart says 'n his bill that in December, 1844, he received rom the company, Eastern division, a work of 1,175 pages.

Stewart says 'n his bill that in December, 1844, he received rom the company two, hundred and filty one-thousand dollar construction bonds, the subject of gaid acts.

On page 132 and following, in his deposition, he says that about sinety-six conds were used to further the interests of the company, and he names Charles Sherman, a private citizen, as one who received twenty. As to the rest, T. O. Durant delivered some and A. Hay the rest, all jof which were subsequently returned to him, in trust for the holders. As neither he nor the company had a wish to disclose their names they were not called for. I call attention to the following, quoted from the 97th page of said record:

"It is agreed in this case that John E. Blaine was the holder of fitteen of the bonds described in the pleadings in this cause, as the construction-bonds of the defendant, series B, and that he received said bonds of the plaintiff, and which were returned to him by said Blaine; that afterwards, at the instance and request of the plaintiff, the defendant; that the delivery of the twelve innegrant bonds, of one thousand dollars each, in fall satisfaction of the fifteen bonds in the hands of the plaintiff, which have not been delivered to this suit, but raid Blaine was the holder of the construction bonds aforesaid in the year 1894.

Parties externed to make to be read in evidence in the cause by the paintiff, 114 18, 18, 1875.

was made since the commencement of this suit, but said Blaine was the holder of the construction bonds aforesaid in the year 1891.

"This statement is made to be read in evidence in the cause by the plaintiff, July, 18, 1870.

"J. P. USHER.

"Joe. B. STEWART.

"Oomplainant in Person."

This was made in 1870, to be used as evidence by Stewart. Why? Stewart was obliged to prove up as to others, why exempt this? Would its ectual proof compromise anybody, or was there no proof? Why prove what the other side does not deny? I would not insinuate that this name was interpolated into the case for any purpose. John E. Blaine is said to have received these bonds in 1854, which is a little funny when it is remembered that Stewart only received them during the last month of that year. In Stewart's letter produced on May i he says that he became John E. Blaine's attorney to settle his claim which grew out of certain stock which he hold of the L. P. and W. R. R. Co., a predecessor of the Kansas Pacific, in 1832, in configuation of which Leite from bage 170, the power of attorney dated May 19, 1843. Stewart jurther says that by various expr dients this claim was finally settled by compromise, and John E. Blaine's as will be remembered, the New York Tribune published a statement that James G. Blaine

had a large interest in this L., P. and W. R. K. Co., (more fully referred to in Gea. Boynton's statement,) which Gen. Ewing so effectually demolished by a letter in the same print of October 11, 1872; that nobody has renewed & since, till James G. Blaine again brought it forward, and although it has nothing to do with the alleged Knowiton story, Mr. Blaine insists it has.

I recur to that first note of Mr. Ewing. He said in it that John E. Blaine was the owner of \$19,000 of the stock of that company, the extent of his interest, and that this was the owner of \$19,000 of the stock of that company, the extent of his interest, and that this was the only interest that any member of the Blaine family ever held. This stock probably never reached 10 in any known market. For this we are told that he received \$15,000 of these bonds of well-known appreciable value. The paper, \$10,000, was increased by its half, and changed for a scourity five-fold its superior, and this Joe Stewart calls a compromise. He ought to know, for he was attorney for both parties, as he says. Ohe other curious thing: Stewart's power of attorney was made in 1853. It was executed by him in 1834 by the delivery to J. E. Blaine of these bonds, as we are told, but on the 8th of December, 1868, by solemn writing, Stewart substituted this same already executed power of attorney. [See Record, pp. 170, 171.] Is it indeed true that the supulation of Stewart and Usher at p. 97 was made for a siniter purpose? But, I am making no case against J. E. Blaine of J. G. Blaine. I am only to see that they make no case on Mr. Knowiton.

By recurrence again to the above stipulation, we see that it purports that the fifteen bonds were again returned to Stewart, and that afterwards at his instance the railroad company gave J. E. Blaine §1, 2, 600 in land grant bonds for them, but the company had not at that time received the fifteen construction bonds. It will be seen how this was seemingly made to fit another paper given hereafter, from p. 785. It appears by an arrang

I ask attention to the following: [See Rec. p. 1130.]

J. D. Perry, e.g., President U. P. R. R. Co., E. D.:
Please deliver to Thomas Ewing, jr., or order, eight of the land grant bonds of your said company, held for exchange for the construction bonds claimed to have been made by the company and by you placed in the hands of J. G. Kennedy and now owned by me. And this shall be my receipt to the company for eight of said land-grant bonds when said construction bonds shall be presented for exchange. I have heretofore given to said Ewing an order on the company for the equivalent in land-grant bonds of twenty-five of said construction bonds. This order now being given the holder of the former order, on presenting it, will be entitled to the equivalent in land-grant bonds of fifteen of said construction bonds, instead of twenty-five.

WARHINGTON, October 29, 1886.

Thomas Ewing, in his testimony at page 1133.

instead of twenty-five. Jos. B. STEWART.

WASHINGTON, October 27, 1836.

Thomas Ewing, in his testimony at page 1133, says that he was to receive ten of the construction bonds from Stewart for services. This arrangement was made in 1866, for which he took the above_order. That, in fact, he myer got any bends of any kind. I return to the two last sentences of the above order—"I have horetofore given to said Ewing an order for the equivalent in land grant bonds of fwenty_fixe of said construction bonds. This order now being given, the holder of the former order on presenting it will be entitled to the equivalent in land grant bonds of fittenty fixe. This apparently means that before that time, October 24, 1866. Stewart had delivered to some man, whom he does not care to name, twenty-five of the construction bonds. That thereafter he delivered to said Ewing for that man, an order on the cempany for land grant bonds, which order that man still held, and is referred to as "the holder of the former order." Whoever he was Stewart took the liberty of setting off ten of his construction bonds to Thomas Ewing, which "said holder" would not submit to, and Ewing got none. The following is so much of the letter of Stewart to the president of the road as seems to bear on this matter, quot¹d from page 785 of the record, already referred to New York, April 23, 1838.

John D. Perry, Preticat of the Union Pacific

stready referred to:

NEW YORK, April 23, 1838.

John D. Perry, Preriocal of the Union Pacific
Ratiroed Company:
DEAR Six: In compliance with your request, I
will state that the total claims on me for any
portion of the Union Pacific railroad, E. D. construction bonds, are as follows:

1 have settled with all the other parties. The three last named, that is-

bonds, are to be paid in full, as per orders.

These were stipulated to be paid since the agreement of the 6th of January, 1864, and are for distinct and specific considerations. Fant's for money, Usher's for some railroad stock I purchased for him, and Keeler's for a private contract between him and myself. But the Ewing 10, Haine 10, and Keeler's for a private contract between him and myself. But the Ewing 10, Haine 10, and Keeler's for a private contract between him and myself. But the Ewing 10, Haine 10, and Keeler's for a private contract between him and myself. But the Ewing 10, Haine 10, and 11, and 120 per cent.) agreed on between Mr. Durant and myself before and at the time he ratified the settlement of the 6th of January, 1865, which deduction, applying to the whole 174 bonds then outstanding, makes the difference between the whole amount (174) series Beoustruction bonds outstanding, and the lesser amount in your hands to be exchanged.

I was compelled to accede to the reduction in favor of Durant, in order to induce him to agree to the settlement and compromise of the 6th of January, 1866, and he was as careful to draw the deduction as well on the 174 that were not returned at the time of the general exchange, as well as those that were exchanged, just leaving the exact amount in hand that were to be exchanged for the whole 174.

Jos. R. Stewart.

Indersed—Statement of Jos. R. Stewart.

Indersed—Statement of Jos. R. Stewart.

Indersed—Statement of Jos. R. Stewart.

And the holder of Stewart's order for their equivalents in land, grant bonds, mentioned in Stewart's order to the wonty, five construction bonds, and the holder of Stewart's refer for their equivalents in land, grant bonds, mentioned in Stewart's order to Ewing, and this in the face of the stipulation in reference to J. E. Blaine's fitteen bonds, sorter for the parties maned there have claims on him for construction bonds, and although by the stipulation in reference to J. E. Blaine, (Rec., pp. 677-17,) so that at that time J. E. Blaine is

bonds."

Why [did he do this? That it was by accident—another mistake 'n the same name—no man will believe. Had "James" been originally written by inadvertency, why not now give the true name and explain by proof, if necessary, how the mistake arose? This omission was by design—purposely made, without a word of explanation then and none now, with all the intervening time in which to invent one. It was to serve some parpose, shield some person, gain some point deaired by both partiesto the suit.

I quote from a carefully prepared copy of Stewart's deposition in an abstract used on the trial of said case in 1872, at Topeka, in the presence of the original. In answer to cross-interrogatory 178 he said:

"I further state, as in direct examination, that the president of the defendant, Mr. John B. Perry, and its counsel, Hon. John P. Usher, have both repeatedly stated to me, and I believe to others, that I was entitled to my bonds and ought to receive them whenever I should be able to produce the said series B bonds. Among others, I am informed and believe that Mr. Usher made that statement to Mr. Alexander Hay and Hon. James Blaine in Washington."

On turning to the record, copied from the same paper three years later, I find the Ron. James Blaine Changed to the Hon. James Lane—oot James H Lane. There seems no end to the so-called mistakes in this name. No man would write Blaine for Lane in 1872. There may be a reason for writing Lane for Blaine in 1873. This same Blaine lost his James in 1873, and has lost his "B and "1" now.

If I am misled in the construction of Stawart's order to Ewing, his letter to Perry, his copy of it, in the light of other parts of the record, it is quite within the power of Mr. Ewing, Mr. Stewart and others to set me right at once, and I hope this may be done. Thus far, Mr. Ewing contents binnell with calling attention to the similarity in the sounds of J. E. Blaine and J. G. Blaine as leading to this charge against James G. while Stewart is still silem. Most singular of all its it that wh

AMERICA'S EXHIBITION.

OF VISITORS ALL MONEY GOOD NOW

this morning has invited large numbers of visi-tors out to the Centennial grounds. Around the gates it is easy to observe a decided increase over yesterday in the crowd entering the grounds. Up to 11 o'clock there were about forty thousand visitors. The walking facilities are much better to-day. Improvements are evidently taking place on the principal avenues, and within a very few tion. Car-loads of goods are still arriving from all points, especially from the West. Most of the articles are deposited in Machinery hall. The building most backward in preparation now is Agricultural hall, which will not be in order for a

PHILADELPRIA, PA., May 13.—A large meeting of citizens to protest against the closing of the Centennial Exhibition buildings on Sunday was held to-night at Musical Fund hall. Rev. Dr. Furness presided, and addresses were made by the chairman, George W. Biddle, esq., Colonel John W. Forney, Dr. Bellows, of New York, and Colonel Fitzgerald.

"FIFTY CENTS OF ANY KIND."

PHILADELPHIA, May 14.—The Centennial Commission have done away with the regulation requiring a fifty-cent note or a fifty-cent silver piece to secure admission. Hereafter fifty cents of any kind, so it is genuine, will admit a visitor.

A second edition of the official catalogue will be issued in a short time. The various inacuracies in the present issue will be rectified. Suitable blanks have been provided by the commissioners for exhibitors to facilitate the latter in giving proper information to the judges.

About the 30th of the present month the unveiling of the Witherspoon monument will take place. Governor Bedie, of New Jersey, has been chosen orator for the occasion.

For the Fourth of July quite a number of demonstrations have been arranged. To-day the avenues leading to the grounds present the same busy scenes of last week, except that the gates of the Exhibition were closed. The avenues were lined with people and vehicles, and the "FIFTY CENTS OF ANY KIND."

STREET STANDS
did a thriving business. The extra city police force was on duty throughout the day. The arrangements for the unveiling of the Humboldt memorial will be matured in the course of a week or two. or two.

On the 4th of July the ceremonies attending the unveiling of the monument to religious liberty and the Catholic temperance fountain will take

place.
The special committee preparing the list of judges of the committees of award authorize the statement that the publication by a New York journal of what purports to be a list of such judges is incorrect in

as to be entirely valueless is a guide. The published list was one of several projects rejected without being revised. It was only fractionally correct, and several weeks old, of which a few printed copies were held for the personal use of the committee. The official list is, meanwhile, being changed from time to time, in the process of being perfected.

Important substitutions recently made where the original appointees decline to serve, and their places were filled by others, are omitted from the newspaper publication, and the names intended for many who have accorded amplications.

Music by Electricity-Tropical Temperature Secured—Gilmore's Concert.

(Special Correspondence of the Nat. Republican.)

PHILADELPHIA, May 12, 1876.

PHILADELPHIA, May 12, 1876.

The second day of the Centennial was the pleasantest that we have had for weeks—clear and almost chilly. The grounds were in a and almost chilly. The grounds were is a splendid condition, and there was plenty of room to move round in. Although there were thousands in the grounds, so vast are the buildings that their numbers were not apparent. The ears were comfortably filled, and there were plenty of vehicles at the gates to tranport passengers at regular rates. Horticultural hall was my first point of attack, and it proved a disappointment. The building is very imposing from the exterior, and gives a promise of interior vastness which it does not fulfill. The collection of trees and plants is not as large or beautiful as that of the botani-

cal gardens, and the conservatories on either side of the central hall are used as forcing houses, where the plants intended to fill the parterres are kept. There is nothing unusual among the specimens, several orange and lemon trees and numbers of palms being the most interesting. At the east end of the gallery is an ingenious musical combination, consisting of an ORGAN AND BRASSTRAND played by electricity. The whole apparatus occupies a case not much larger than a good sized cabinet organ, and is managed by two persons, one to pump in the air and one to watch the score. The score of the piece played consists of a long strip of paper with punctures in it at correct distances, to represent the notes. This strip then passes over a cylinder the surface of which is full of small pins, and these pins rising through the holes touch the wires above, and connect with the keys of the organ or brass instrument. It is a most wonderful affair, and was surrounded by inquisitive crowds all day. The idea of playing an organ and band by telegraph is certainly American throughout. Such an instrument without the brass hand would be much more creditable to some of our churches than the self-styled organists who create such frightful effects. In one of the side rooms are several beautiful cases of skeletonized leaves and some illustrations of a plan by which we can escape all the inconveniences of cold weather. The plan proposes a hotel with gardens overed with glass, surrounded by a

a mile long. The temperature is to be kept at a certain point, and all invalids are to be cured forthwith, although how they are to get fresh his to breathe does not appear. The other invention of this remarkable genius is to have the side-walks of our city streets protected from rain, wind and snow by an irou framework and heavy plateglass side and top. Doors at proper distances will allow entrance and exit, and in this way the pedestrian can sail along in the tropical zone, while just outside of the curb winter is raging. The opportunity this glass wall would afford to small boys skilled in throwing stones is another attraction. From the galiery which surrounds the outside of the buildings a fine view was obtained of the grounds within the incleasure. The flower beds around Horticultural Hall are beautifully laid out and filled with blooming plants and curiously trained shrubs. We spent some time trying to find the conservatory devoted to the Victoria regia, the great water illy of South Aftica, but could not discover any signs of it, nor find any one who knew anything about it. Just across from this hall the "Great American Restaurant" was doing a flourishing business, and had a brass band playing on the plazara to attract customers. Further on towards the Ladies' Pavilion the

PASSING OVER TO MACHINERY HALL, PASSING OVER TO MACHINERY HALL, we went to the printing press where the New York Times was printed and given to the crowd. The electrotype plates are sent from New York as made via the morning train, and all day this press printed and distributed them. Leaving, we as made via the morning train, and all day this press printed and distributed them. Leaving, we took an open wagonette, and drove down Chesnut street to see the decorations put up for the opening of the Centennial. Several square miles of bunting was cut and dressed in every known way, and fluttered from end to end of the street. As a monument of ill-taste and vulgarity grand, old Independence Hail was covered from its base to the cupola with gaudy flags and festoons. Why it was thought necessary to thus concoal and disfigure the most sacred building on our shores no sane person can prejend to tell. When we reflect that merely the use of all this aboninable trash costs ten thousand dollars, we are fain to say that Philadelphia has gone stark, staring crasy over the Centennial, and is no longer cognizant of its actions.

CURRENT CAPITAL TOPICS.

Read What the Rebel Senator Has to Say. The following is an extract from the speech of Governor Coke, of Texas, as printed in a Demo-eratic paper. * * I ask you, fellow-citisens, Governor Coke, of Texas, as printed in a Democratic paper. * * I ask you, fellow-citizens, to efect the man to represent you in the Senate of of the United States that represents you; a man who rejoices with you—who has rejoiced with you when you rejoiced, and who has wept with you when you wept, The Judge pictured most graphically the miseries of the war, and that Judge Hancock is honest and patriotic, I have no doubt. I have always believed him an honest and patriotic man, but there are two sides to every question. When I look at that question, while I see the misery of my country, the sad condition to which they were reduced, I look, too, upon the other side and see that which is not visible to his vision—I see the glories of Lee and Jackson; I see the blood, the suffering, the death, the carnage borne unflinchingly by a devoted people in defense of what they believed to be right and for native land. Judge Hancock loves Texas as well as I do. I know it; I know it. It was my part to perform but humble service during the war. I was a captain of a volunteer company, I went as a junior capts in an infantry regiment; and, gentlemen, for four long years I carried my haversack in Virginia, in Louislans and Arkansas. I believed that my people had a right to my services; I believed that the country in which I was born and which gave me nutriment and reared me to manhood, whether I believed she was right or wrong—and I believed she was right—was entitled to my services; and acted upon his. He was as sincere in his convictions. Judge Hancock believed otherwise, and acted upon his. He was as sincere in his convictions as I was in mine. Now he says we are competitors for the United States Senate. He raises this issue and I accept it, and say, gentlemen, choose between Judge Hancock as when they lod Confederate regiments and divisions, as my friend Judge Hancock who went to the North during the war. I believe, and the only advice I have to give is, let the man you select to the Northern people, and fellow-citizens, there

eldedly interesting. When the letters and indict-ments that have been printed in THE REPUBLI-CAN were read there was a good deal of amusecan were read there was a good deal of amusement resulting from Fitzhugh's statement to a friend that he was "a bigger man than old Grant;" that he spent the evening before with hir. and Mrs. Kerr; that Sam Cox was his "wormest" friend, and that his son Fay was the most delighted fellow in the world with a \$2,100 place. The gavel was not large smooth, nor was hir. Cox strong enough in the arms, to preserve order. The members were seized with uncontrollable fits of laughter. During all the excitement Mr. Fitzhugh sat on a back seat, or carouted around with his obtants. Cox strong countries around with his obtants. Cox strong and the service of the service of

to the Committee on Rules the following resolution:
In view of the foregoing letter written by L. H.
Fitzhugh, which has just been read to this House,
without any reference to other charges made
against him, of the truth of which the House is
not informed.

Resolved, That it is the sense of this House that
L. H. Fitzhugh is not a proper person to hold the
honorable and responsible position of Doorkeeper
of the House of Representatives of the United
States, and that the said Fitzhugh, as Doorkeeper, be, and he is hereby, dismissed forthwith
from that office.

Malicious Inventions Against General Bab cock.
The Paltimore Sun of Saturday had the fol-

The Faltimore Sun of Saturday had the following malicious paragraph in its Washington column:

"It is rumored about this city this evening that General O. E. Babcock and his counsel, William A. Cook, left yesterday ostensibly to visit the Centennial, but really to obtain from the burglar, George Miles, now in confinement in the Vermont State penitentiary, some kind of an affidavit in relation to the safe burglary matter. They will also, it is said, visit Harrington, who is now in Canada, and have a talk with him in regard to the same matter."

The paragraph has no foundation of fact whatever. General Babcock has not been out of the city for some time, either to visit the Centennial or for any other purpose. He says he has not the least idea where Harrington is, and that neither he, (Babcock,) nor his counsel, have any intention to communicate with Miles, the burglar, in any way. He says they have no business either with Miles or Harrington in the matter; that he knows nothing about the safe burglary, and has done nothing about thrither than to engage Mr. Cook as counsel to defend him against the indictment of the grand jury when the time comes.

Albert Grant's Case Against Judge Wylie.

Mr. Knott, from the Committee on Jedle'ary, on Saturday presented to the House the following report, which was referred to a special committee,

The Tax on Tebacco and Size of Tebacce Packages.

Mesers Spence, of Cincinnati, and Hudson and Catlin, of St. Louis, were before the sub-Committee on Ways and Means on Saturday in relation to the proposition of the Commissioner of Internat Revenue to cause the packing and stamping of fine-cut chewing-tobacco in retail packages. At present a fine-cut chewing-tobacco manufacturer cannot sell a bucket full to a retailer who will sell five or ten cents' worth to a customer without any system of second stamping, and the manufacturers insist that this privilege shall continue. After hearing a number of arguments from these people, and learning that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue was himself disposed to yield the point, the sub-committee decided to report to the full committee in favor of striking out that paragraph of the new internal revenue bill as regards fine-cut and plug chewing-tobacco.

Ead for McKee, Maguire and Avery.

Ead for McKee, Maguire and Avery. United States District Attorney Dyer has re-United States District Attorney Dyer has reported to the Attorney General unfavorably in the matter of the applications of ex-Collector Maguire and Mr. McKee for pardon. Mr. Maguire was at the Department of Justice Saturday, desiring to have an interview with the Attorney General, but did not see him. Judge Pierrepont considers that it is only proper in such cases that he should give audience to counsel for the convicted persons. It is also understood that an unfavorable report is made in the case of Avery. It cannot be doubted that the friends of these persons will continue to make very persistent efforts to have Executive elemency extended in behalf of the convicted men, notwithstanding the results, thus far, of the applications made to that end.

Hon. Godlove S. Orth.

to Austria, and the Republican homines for fovernor of Indiana, has arrived in the city from Vienna, and is stopping at the Ebbitt house. Mr. Orth's family went immediately home from Philadelphia, but he will remain in the city probably a week. The Indiana Republican Association purpose tendering Mr. Orth a reception before he leaves for his home. Silver Disbursements.

The reports of exchange of sliver for tractional currency, and in payment of checks, up to the 19th inst., make the total of \$4,724,000.

Burdering Serenaders.

St. Lovis, May 14.—A most deplorable affair occurred in the little town of Dahlgren, Hamilton county, Ill., Friday night. A party of young men gave John Sturman, recently married, a serenade. Sturman ordered the party off, but they not leaving at once he fred into them with a gun, killing Willis Lowery and wounding Had Burlen and Frank Taylor. All the parties are highly respectable, young Sturman being a son of Judge Sturman, one of the most prominent citisens of the county.

RESTLESS MEXICO.

AMERICAN CONSUL INSULTED

PROPERTY OF U. S. CITIZENS SEIZED

GALVESTON, TEXAS, March 13.—A special dis-patch to the News, dated Rio Grande City, 13th, says: At daylight this morning Escobedo left says: At cayight this morning Escocodo loft Mier with his force, and it is reported that there has been hard fighting near Camargo. It is not known which side gained the day. It is reported that three hundred were killed and one thousand wounded. A shell struck a church in Camargo, killing a priest and four women, who were at prayers. Four large boats are landing infantry opposite Camargo, on the San Juan river.

prayers. Four large outs are maining immarly opposite Camargo, on the San Juan river.

PHEPARING FOR A FIGHT AT MATAMORAS.

MATAMORAS, May 14.—Gen. Escobedo reached Camargo, one hundred miles distant, yesterday, with 3,000 Government troops, and is advancing rapidly on this city. Generals Tuero and Querago are coming on another road, with 2,000 men, to unite with Escobedo in attacking this place. Great excitement prevails here among the revolutionsts. Several hundred men are repairing the fortifications, and every preparation for a stubborn defense is being made. Yesterday the staff officers of Gen. Gonnalez forcibly took a quantity of lumber belonging to a citizen of the United States for fortifications.

The American Consul intervened to protect the interests of American citizens, when the officer declared they would shoot the German and American Consuls if they interfered with General Gonnaler's efforts to prepare for the defense. The American and German Consuls, with the commander of a United States vessel of war, called on Grouzalez, who disavowed the act of his officer and assured the Jonsuls that foreigners should be respected. Many families of all instinalities are leaving the city in anticipation of a bombardment.

Winslow Not Yet Released. LONDON, May 13.-The ten days for which Winslow was recommitted having expired the application for his release was renewed this morning. It was again opposed by the Government, and he was recommitted for ten days longer. Attorney General Hoeker said that if Secretary been received the Government would not raise any further objections to his release.

THE MUTINERS.
The bark Caswell arrived at Quee The bark Caswell arrived at Queenstown to-day in tow of the gumboat Gonhawk. The muti-neers killed Capt. Eest, who belonged in London; the first and second mates and the seeward, all three of whom were from Glasgow. One of the scamen killed two of the mutineers, both of whom were Greeks? Another Greek sailor was badly veat with a empenter's ax, but survived and was landed a prisoner at Queenstown. Capt. Best was shockingly mutilated. The two mates were shot and slashed. The seward was shot while coming up the coengainon ladder. All four were tied together and threwn overboard. The cap-tain and second mate were then not quite dead.

Great Slaughter of Turks and Insurgents. RAGUSA, May 13.—Advices from Sciavonic sources state that a battle was fought yesterday near Bisses, in which seven hundred Turks and The Turks at Scutari had a celebration over the murder of the German and French consuls at Saronica.

NEW GRAND VILIER IN PAVOR OF REFORM.

BEBLIS, May 13.—Notwithstanding the pessimist language of the newspapers of this city, the
recent ministerial changes in Turkey are regarded
in diplomatic circles as favorable to pacification
and reform. The new Grand Vilier decidedly favors reform, and from the well-known energy of
the new War Minister it is expected that official
protection will be afforded to Christians against
the fanaticism of the Turks.

NEW CASTLE, DEL., May 13.—Ten men were flogged at this place to-day, and afterwards pun-ished in the pillory. William Price and Wilson H. Smith, both colored men, were placed in the stocks from 10 to 11 o'clock a. m., and afterwards

Majesty.

New York. May 14.—The Herald cable special NEW YORK. May 14.—The Herald cable special dated London, 13th, says: On Thursday a grand recoption was held at the Prussian embassy, the entire diplomatic corps being present. On the presentation of Wickham Hoffman, American charge d'affairs to the Empress, her Majesty expressed gratification in being able for the first time to personally express thanks to a member of legation which, during the Franco-German struggle, under these sad and distressing circumstances was so good and so paintaking." Her Majesty also requested Mr. Hoffman to convey her thanks to Minister Washburne, and spoke kindly of Hancroft Davis, American Minister at Berlin.

PHILADELPHIA, May 13 .- At the reception to ex-Speaker Blaine tendered by Mr. Clayton Mac-Michael, at the Penn Club, this evening, some two hundred gentlemen were present, prominent

NEW YORK, May 13 -The Post says the conby Carl Schurz, William Cullen Bryant, Presi-dent Woolsey, ex-Governor Bullock, and Horaco White, will meet at 3 o'clock p. m. on Monday next, in the Fifth Avenue Hotel. About one hun-dred and seventy gentlemen in various parts of the country have accepted the invitation to at-tend the conference. Many others whose private affairs will not permit their attendance have sent-letters expressing their sympathy with the move-ment, and their desire to co-operate. Nearly all the persons who have accepted the invitation are members of the Republican party.

Naptes, May 16.—Two more Italian iron-clads, under Vice Admiral Viry, have gone to Salonica. LONDON, May 13.—Colonel Thornson, Mayor of Liverpool, is dead. The Army and Navy Guzette says the British fleet in the Meditorranean has been ordered to rendezvous immediately at Smyrns, in view of possible Oriental difficulties. Marcere as Minister of the Interior will be garetted immediately after the funeral of M. Ricard.

M. Jules Perry, presiding at a numerously attended meeting of the party of the Left, promised M. De Marcere the support of all the Republican deputies. The Republican ferman deputies. The Republican Francise, M. Gambetta's organ, approves M. De Marcere's appoint, ment. The nunicipality of Parls has voted a loan of 120,056,000 tranes for public works. M. Faye, of the Republican Left, and deputy from the Department of Lot of Garonne, has been appointed to succeed M. De Marcere as Under Secretary of State.

RICHMOND, May 13 .- In the South Baptist

buiness portion of the town of Darlington, S. C., was burned this morning. The entire block was destroyed shelading the stores of Messra. Mannee, Hyams, Higgins, Watson, Steinhurger, Williamson, Welch, Calmus, Lementhal, and others, with Mrs. Gibson's fine residence. The loss is essi-

FORTY-FOURTH CONGRESS.

SATURDAY, May 13, 1816

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. KNOTT, of Kentucky, from the Commit ee on the Judiciary, to which had been referred ertain memorials of Albert Graut in relation to

OFFICIAL CONDUCT OF ANDREW WYLIE, me of the justices of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, submitted a report. The

committee say they have given the memorialist a patient hearing, and it appears from his statement that an investigation of the subject-matter of the memorials will require an examination of several quite complicated questions in equity and the examination of a large number of witnesses. The committee have formed no opinion of the truth or claim of the charges but the committee have formed no opinion of the truth or falsity of the charges, but the committee to their consideration by the House. They there, to their consideration by the House. They, there-fore, ask to be discharged from the fur her con-sideration of the memorials, and that they be re-ferred to a special committee. The recommenda-tion of the committee was agreed to. Mr. DURHAM, of Ky., rose to a personal ex-planation, and had read so much of a letter written by G. T. Welsh, and published in the Louisville Courier of May 5, as related to his (Mr. Dyn-HAM's) knowledge of perjury and other crimes on

Courier of May a, as remarks and other crimes on the part of L. H. Fitningh, Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives. House of Representatives.

Mr. Dunham then said that he was acquainted with the circumstances only so far as that, when

pitzhugh was indicated for three offenses, for which he was tried and acquitted, he (Mr. Durham) was one of his counsel. Afterwards a negro named Tom Scott sued in the Federal courts for damages, the suit being against some very respectable citizens of Kontucky, who were charged with conspiracy, in that they had accused said Scott of crime. At that trial Mr. Fitzhugh was summoned and sworn as a witness. He (Mr. Durham) was also summoned and sworn and examined. At the trial he (Mr. Durham) recollected all the circumstances distinctly, and Mr. Fitzhugh made statements which were contradictory and irreconcilable and at variance with the truth, as he (Mr. Durham), remembered them. Owing to sickness in his family, Mr. Durham did not reach Washington in December until the Menday of the organization of the House. The caucus to select officers was held on the preceding Saturday, and he was not aware that Col. Fitzhugh was a candidate. Had he been here on the Saturday of the caucus he would have stated the facts as he understood them, and let the members of the caucus judge if Fitzhugh was a proper person to be elected an officer of the House. He had no acquaintance with Fitzhugh before he became his counsel, and he (Fitzhugh) was at that time a popular man in the county. He made this statement merely to show how far he was connected with the matter, and not for the benefit of those who were

PAMILIAR WITH THE PACTS. Mr. WHITE, of Ky, also rose to a question of privilege, and sent to the Clerk's desk to have read an article from the Naryowal Expussional, as we day a go, charging Mr. Fitshugh with having been guilty of erimes while in Texas.

Messra, RANDALL and HOLMAN made the Messrs, RANDALL and HOLMAN made the point that this was not a question of privilege. The SPEAKER ruled that it was a question of privilege, as it effected an officer of the House. The article was then read at length. Mr. WHITE also had read at length the letter to the Courier Journal, and the letter written by Fitzhugh to a friend in Texas, in which he detailed the influence he had as Doorkeeper, and which has been published far and wide. After the papers had been read, Mr. White offered a resolution directing the Committee on Hules to inquire into the conduct of L. H. Fitzhugh, and report by resolution or otherwise if there is anything in the conduct of said Fitzhugh to make him unworthy of holding

him unworthy of holding

AN OPPICE IN THIS HOUSE.

Mr. WHITEsaid it was a duty to investigate the matter, and if Fitzhugh is guilty he should be dismissed. He hoped the House was 4 200°; his resolution, and that the committee would not let it sizely.

Mr. REAGAN, of Twas, said as he had urged Mr. Fitzhugh's election, it was due to himself that he should say a word. If a seaplution had been offered some days ago to dismiss Fitzhugh on account of the foolish letter he wrote, he will have thought it the shortest way to get rid of himself that he should say and the second, and while the Doorkeeper would have resigned on account of the foolish letter, he cannot resign while these charges are hanging over him. The charges are very serious, and he should have a hearing, although it was also stated that he hear hearing, although it was also stated that he hear hearing, although it was also stated that he hear hear hear of these charges. He wanted also to say that he never heard of these charges

THESE CHARGES OVER HIM.

Mr. GLOVER, of Mo., offered as a substitute for Mr. White's proposition a resolution declaring it to be the sense of the House that L. H. Fitzhugh is not a proper person to hold the responsible position of Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, and that he be dismissed forthwith from that office.

Mr. REAGAN hoped that there would be no such summary proceeding in view of the criminal charges.

Mr. HOAR, of Mass, said he trusted the House would take no action in haste which would stamp this man with crime. It was admitted that he wrote the foolish letter which had been read, and it showed that he was not competent to hold an office here. He therefore suggested that the resolution be so modified as to declare that his dismissal was on

ACCOUNT OF THAT LETTER.

Mr. GLOVER accepted the medification, and Mr. WHITE accepted Mr. GLOVIN's resolution as medified.

Mr. GLOVER thought now the resolution abouid be adopted, for this man had imposed upon the House by hiding his antecedents from his riends.

should be adopted, for this man had imposed upon the Home by hiding his antecedents from his riends.

Mr. SINGLETON, of Miss., said a charge of serious crime had been made in the face of the whole country, and which would stand on the Recorf for all time. And now to adopt this resolution would be to brand him with crime. This summary process should not be adopted without an opportunity for explanation.

Mr. HARRISON, of Ill., doubted whether the House should go into this investigation. If the House should go into this investigation. If the House should go into this investigation. If the House should go into this investigated in the propriety of disalissing the officer, but would be investigating all year round. He doubted the propriety of disalissing the officer, but would suggest an amendment that

Mr. CONGER, of Mich, contended that it would not be just to summarily dismiss Fitzingh while these charges were hanging over him, and without an investigation. The American people desired fair play, and it would be not fair play to adopt this renolution without an investigation. He would demand this for his political friends, and would also demand it for his political friends, and would also demand it for his political friends, and would also demand it for his political friends, and would also demand it for his bolitical friends, and the see charges over him this man could never regain the respect of his fellow man if this summary dismissal should take place. He would give the officer an opportunity to vindicate his character.

Mr. SOUTHARD, of Ohlo, wanted the resolu-

the omeer an opportunity to vindicate his charac-ter.

Mr. SOUTHARD, of Ohio, wanted the resolu-tion adopted as Mr. Gloven offered it. He was in favor of investigations, but there was nothing here to investigate. The House ought not to re-view the action of the courts. The letter Fiza-hugh wrote was indecent and indecorour, and for that HE SHOULD BE DISMISSED.

Mr. PHILLIPS, of Mo., opposed any summary proceeding. He had seen no ordence that Fitznugh wrote the letter, or that it was genuine. There may have been interpolations, and Fitzhugh might be able to explain the letter, and he should have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. GLOVER said he knew the letter was genuine, because he had seen the original and was ramiliar with Fitzhugh's handwriting.

Mr. LAMAR, of Miss., believed that the resolution should be referred to a committee. It is true that with the charges came the statement that this man was tried and acquitted. But the inputation is clear and explicit, and the charges show upon their face at least moral turpitude and infamy, although he was not convicted, and if the House expels him now on account of that toolish and ridiculous letter this moral turpitude will attach to him. To expel him on that letter, without an examination of the charges, would look as though the House was resorting to a subterfage to

Mr. KANDALL, of Pa., said the time may come when it will be necessary to expel this officer, but that time was not now. Give him a hearing, and the House would do itself more credit.

Mr. BANKS, of Massachusetts, said the House owed something to itself, as well as to the officer, and it would be unjust to summarily expel him with these charges over him. The letter shows he is utterly unfit to hold the office, but he should have an opportunity to explain. He would, thereie, suggest that the subject be referred to the maintee on Rules, and that pending the investigation Fitshugh be suspended from office.

Mr. GLOVER could not accept the latter say-gestion, but in deference to the wishes of members he would move to refer the matter to the Committee of Rules.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The House then went into Committee of the Whole on the Post Office appropriation bill, Mr. Sprinkern, of Illinois, in the chair.

When the paragraph in relation to salaries of postmasters was reached an effort was made to put the salary of the postmaster at New York at \$8,000, the committee having reduced it to \$6,000.

Mr. HOLMAN deprenated the effort to increase